

Department of Public Affairs and Administration (PUAD)
Annual Report to CAPR
MPA Program

1. Brief Self-Study

This brief self-study provides information on the MPA program's progress toward the objectives outlined in the previous five-year program review, barriers to meeting those objectives, and reevaluation of some objectives. Substantial progress has been made in a number of the objectives outlined in the five-year review, including curriculum revision, implementing new course delivery options, admission requirement revision, improved advising, increased assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs), monitoring of the student evaluation process, and improved enrollment management.

In regards to curriculum revision, the MPA Curriculum Committee has approved reducing the number of options from three to two: Public Management and Health Care Administration. PUAD will submit the paperwork to implement the elimination of the Public Management and Policy Analysis option and the Human Resources and Organizational Change option, the modification of the remaining two options, and course modification and deletions in the first meeting in Fall 11 of the CLASS Curriculum Committee. In regards to assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs), we are continuing to develop SLOs for each of the courses, are participating in the CLASS Assessment Program with specific assessment targets, and have developed a curriculum map for the health care administration option.

In regards to new course delivery options, PUAD is now offering the majority of its courses in hybrid mode and PUAD has developed departmental guidelines regarding hybrid courses. As part of the guidelines, faculty must participate in Blackboard training before they may offer a hybrid course and each hybrid course must have a variety of instructional materials for the online sessions. In regards to the admission requirements, we have revised the process by which applications are evaluated and have provided specific instructions on the PUAD website regarding the content and format of letters of recommendation and the statements of purpose. In regard to advising, we now offer a student orientation in the Fall and Spring quarters (our admission quarters), have developed degree completion roadmaps, and have created an annual course listing. In regards to enrollment management, we require permission numbers for all of our 6000-level courses and before a permission number is issued, the student's record is checked for completion of foundation and pre-requisite courses with an adequate grade (B or better for the foundation courses).

Although we found no evidence of any misconduct in our investigation of the outside reviewer's remark in the five-year review regarding "trading grades for positive student evaluations", we include a discussion about the importance and use of student evaluations in our orientations, continue to follow the University procedures regarding student evaluations, and the department chair frequently meets with students to discuss how student evaluations are being collected.

The objective of re-establishing accreditation from the National Association of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) is being re-evaluated. As part of this re-evaluation, we have determined that many public administration programs do not find NASPAA accreditation a compelling goal. For example, nine (36%) of the top twenty-five MPA programs in the US do not have NASPAA accreditation. Within California, a number of UC and CSU MPA programs are not NASPAA-accredited and many are not even institutional members of NASPAA. Within the CSU system, Sonoma, San Luis Obispo, and San Marcus are not members of NASPAA. The following are NASPAA institutional members but do not have NASPAA accreditation: Channel Islands, Humboldt, Maritime Academy, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, and Sacramento. In addition, a research

study published in the *Journal of Business and Public Affairs* found that the overall rate of accreditation among programs in public administration is low, accreditation is generally found only in large MPA programs with high levels of programmatic resources, and MPA programs with an applied focus generally do not have accreditation.

A thorough examination of the potential costs of re-establishing NASPAA accreditation leads us to question whether the value is sufficient to merit the necessary investments, which would include increasing the MPA faculty by two tenure-track faculty, adding administrative support, increasing release time for the Graduate Coordinator, and decreasing class sizes. It seems unlikely that this level of increase in programmatic cost will be possible in the foreseeable future.

Unlike degrees from some other professional graduate programs that require accreditation for access to licensure, in the MPA program the lack of accreditation does not provide a barrier to entry or to success in the field of public administration. For example, PUAD has recently partnered with the Alameda County Human Resource Services Department (ACHRSD) and the Alameda County Education and Training Center (ACETC) to design a workforce development and succession plan for Alameda County public employees. A significant part of the workforce development plan is to create career ladders for the public employees that are tied to educational achievement. PUAD has been designated by ACHRSD and ACETC as the “educational provider of choice” and we are currently offering the MPA program to multiple cohorts of Alameda County public employees. ACHRSD and ACETC want to expand the partnership with PAUD by including other PUAD degree programs and course offerings as part of its workforce development plan and we want to focus our efforts on expanding our Alameda County partnership and on developing similar partnerships with other major public employers. Creating the accelerated MPA program as described in the five-year review is a part of this partnership expansion, although the budget crisis will probably slow our progress with this objective.

2. Summary of Assessment Results

Course - Quarter	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Difference
HCA 6240 – Winter 07	13.3	83.6	70.3
HCA 6240 – Winter 08	0.0	86.9	86.9
HCA 6260 – Spring 07	46.7	90.4	43.7
HCA 6260 – Spring 08	53.3	92.8	39.5
HCA 6260 – Spring 09	80.2	89.3	9.1
HCA 6280 – Fall 07	75.8	92.6	16.8
HCA 6280 – Fall 08	73.7	90.8	17.1
HCA 6280 – Fall 09	80.2	95.4	15.2

In regards to assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs), we are continuing to develop SLOs for each of the courses, are participating in the CLASS Assessment Program with specific assessment targets, and have developed a curriculum map for the health care administration option. We are using a pre/post test approach to assessing student learning in most of the health care administration option courses, and have begun to develop that approach for the other option areas. We have developed course-specific SLOs that are assessed through a pre-test/post-test design. At the beginning of each course, a 15-question test is administered (pre-test) and the same test is administered (post-test) at the end of the course. The tests are then compared to assess the change in student learning.

3. Planning and Institutional Research

Headcount Enrollment	Fall Quarter				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Public Administration					
3. Graduate	176	185	206	236	198
4. Total Number of Majors	176	185	206	236	198
Degrees Awarded	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09
Public Administration					
2. Graduate	83	85	81	83	92
3. Total Number of Majors	83	85	81	83	92
Public Affairs & Administration					
	Fall Quarter				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
A. Students Headcount					
1. Undergraduate	199	270	330	427	524
2. Postbaccalaureate	5	9	4	7	7
3. Graduate	176	185	206	236	198
	380	464	540	670	729
B. Degrees Awarded	College Years				
	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	99	107	106	111	124
3. Total	99	107	106	111	124
	Fall Quarter				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	7	6	7	7	7
2. Part-Time	0	1	1	1	1
3a. Total Tenure Track	7	7	8	8	8
3b. % Tenure Track	50.0%	41.2%	47.1%	44.4%	44.4%
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	0	0	0	0	0
5. Part-Time	7	10	9	10	10
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	7	10	9	10	10
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	50.0%	58.8%	52.9%	55.6%	55.6%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	14	17	17	18	18
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	6.3	5.7	7.0	6.8	6.7
9. Lecturer FTEF	2.5	3.2	9.0	1.9	0.8
10. Total Instructional FTEF	8.8	8.9	16.0	8.7	7.5
Lecturer Teaching					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	80.8	77.1	98.9	90.9	125.9
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	58.9%	52.0%	59.2%	56.3%	87.2%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	56.3	71.2	68.3	70.7	18.4
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	41.1%	48.0%	40.8%	43.7%	12.8%
13. Total FTES taught	137.1	148.3	167.2	161.6	144.3
14. Total SCU taught	2056.0	2224.0	2508.0	2424.0	2164.0
D. Student Faculty Ratios					

1. Tenured/Track	12.8	13.6	14.1	13.3	18.9
2. Lecturer	22.6	22.3	7.6	37.8	23.0
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	15.6	16.7	10.5	18.6	19.3
4. Lower Division	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Upper Division	26.3	26.8	15.9	28.5	31.8
6. Graduate	13.1	13.6	9.0	15.1	15.9
<i>E. Section Size</i>					
1. Number of Sections Offered	27.0	28.0	30.0	32.0	25.0
2. Average Section Size	23.0	22.3	23.5	20.5	24.9
3. Average Section Size for LD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Average Section Size for UD	32.4	30.1	32.7	34.1	38.2
5. Average Section Size for GD	20.2	19.1	20.8	16.2	20.8
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	2	3	5	3	5
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	16	13	14	18	17
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	3	4	1	4	0
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	6	8	10	7	3

Source and definitions available at:

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/apr/summary/definitions.pdf>